



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/024,351 | 12/21/2001 | Gilles Rubinstenn | 05725.1009-00 | 4841 |
| 22852 | 7590 | 09/03/2009 | | |
| FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| BORISSOV, IGOR N | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3628 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 09/03/2009 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: GILLES RUBINSTENN and FRANCES PRUCHE

Application No. 10/024,351
Technology Center 3600

Mailed: September 3, 2009

Before Deborah L. Perry, Supervisory Paralegal Specialist, Review Team.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on August 10, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S CONSIDERATION OF REPLY BRIEF

A Reply Brief was filed on May 18, 2009, in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed March 17, 2009.

Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, §41.43 states:

(a)(1)... the primary examiner must acknowledge receipt and entry of the reply brief. In addition, the primary examiner may withdraw the final rejection and reopen prosecution or may furnish a supplemental examiner's answer responding to any new issue raised in the reply brief.

The Acknowledgment of the Reply Brief, mailed August 4, 2009, was an improper acknowledgment, as it constitutes a Supplemental Examiner's Answer as per MPEP§ 1208, part II. A Supplemental Examiner's Answers requires a Director or designees approval.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner to:

1) vacate the Acknowledgment of the Reply Brief, mailed August 4, 2009;

2) issue and mail either:

a) a substitute Acknowledgment of the Reply Brief, properly acknowledging to the Reply Brief dated May 18, 2009, in accordance with MPEP§ 1208, part II.; OR

- b) if appropriate, issue a Supplemental Examiner's Answer with the required signature (Technology Center Director or designee), if appropriate; and
- 3) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DLP/bar

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413